



Dear Mr. Bennett:

This letter is a reply to the initial office action, sent to me in response to my communication filed on 10 November 2003. It is clear that the claims should be modified to adjust their scope. I am requesting advice as to how to clarify the intent of these claims, while preserving the obvious value of their underlying specifications. First, please allow me to summarize the merit of this invention.

One of the primary features of this device is its ability to be stored in a closed position. That allows it to be stored, say, in the glove box of an automobile, adjacent to important papers such as a vehicle registration, without contaminating them. This is an obvious advantage over anything that does not possess the ability to be stored in a closed position, including that which is presented in the Michaels device. Our device is a better device than other examples, such as the one taught by Michaels, or say, an ordinary rag. In fact, with respect to contamination, one could easily say that the Michaels device is no better than an ordinary rag.

Furthermore, although our device shares commonalities with the Merkes device, including its general utility as a cleaner, and its suitability—at least in part—to fabrication of unitary elements, the following should be noted and emphasized. Our device applies to a specific field. It is not intended for cleaning phonograph records, any more than the Merkes device is intended for absorbing motor oil conveniently. Here, Merkes did not invent cleaning, or the process of extrusion.

An appropriate analogy of your rejection, Mr. Bennett, would be the insistence that, because an ordinary rag is essentially a unitary piece, it can no longer be used, made, or sold as a cleaning aid, in light of Merkes' revolutionary cleaning device. In fact, the very act of general cleaning, according to your reasoning, may no longer be performed without the Merkes device. Of course, this is not what you expect to maintain. But, with all due respect, it helps to characterize your method of deliberation in this case.

There exists a certain usefulness and novelty to our device. This much is readily apparent within the body of the application. I kindly ask you for your assistance in presenting these rejected claims in a way that compounds the advantages of our device more effectively, and in a way that is much more to your liking.

Thank you,

Ken Campbell